

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 8 and 13, 14, and 36 - 38 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 4 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the application regards as the invention.

The Examiner alleges that the claimed aperture being “partially opened” is indefinite. Notwithstanding, claim 4 has been amended to call for the metal layer of the display electrodes to have an aperture in the laminated structure, and to further include a transmissive display function using the aperture of the metal layer as a light transmissive section. Since, claim 4 no longer calls for an aperture being “partially opened”, this rejection should be moot.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 - 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Morokawa (U.S. Pat. No. 4824213). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to call for a display device substrate comprising display electrodes that include a laminated structure of a transparent conductive layer and a metal layer. Claim 1 has also been amended to call for a reflective display function using the region of the metal layer as a light reflective section. This subject matter was found in dependent claims 4 and 7, respectively. Since the subject matter of

claim 7 was found to be allowable, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 and each corresponding dependent claim should now also be allowable. That is, Morokawa fails to disclose such a display device substrate and, therefore, claim 1 and each corresponding dependent claim is not anticipated.

Claims 1 – 4, 6, 8, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taniguchi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5187604). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, claim 1 has been amended to call for a display device substrate comprising display electrodes that include a laminated structure of a transparent conductive layer and a metal layer, and claim 1 has also been amended to call for a reflective display function using the region of the metal layer as a light reflective section. Taniguchi fails to disclose such a display device substrate. As such, claim 1 and each dependent claim is not anticipated by Taniguchi.

Further, claim 14 has also been amended to call for the display electrodes to include a laminated structure of a transparent conductive layer and a metal layer, and a reflective display function using the region of the metal layer as a light reflective section. As stated above, Taniguchi fails to disclose such a display device substrate and, therefore, claim 14 is not anticipated.

Moreover, this subject matter was found in dependent claims 4 and 7, respectively. Since the subject matter of claim 7 was found to be allowable, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 14, and each corresponding dependent claim should now also be allowable. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is requested to be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi et al., (U.S. Pat. No. 5187604. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Analogous to Claims 1 and 14, claim 13 has been amended to call for the display electrodes to include a laminated structure of a transparent conductive layer and a metal layer, and a reflective display function using the region of the metal layer as a light reflective section. As stated above, Taniguchi does not anticipate such a structure. Further, Taniguchi does not provide any teachings, suggestion, or motivation to utilize such a structure. As such, the claimed structure would not have been obvious. Claim 13, therefore, should also be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 14 to include the limitations of claim 7 and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 1, 13, and 14 should now be in condition for allowance.

### **NEW CLAIMS**

New claim 36-38 have been added. These claims are supported on pages 28-29 of the specification and, for example, in Figure 5. Neither Morokawa nor Taniguchi

anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of these claims. That is, Morokawa does not teach a metal layer formed continuously from the display electrode to the wiring. Moreover, neither Morokawa nor Taniguchi teach a metal layer that runs along an edge portion of the transparent conductive layer, or a metal layer that is narrower than the transparent conductive layer. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 36-38 are in condition for allowance.

Favorable consideration of these new claims is respectfully requested.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct 28, 2003

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/JAH/mb

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344